

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 21, and 28 have been cancelled.  
Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 20, 22, 24-25, 27, and 29-30 have been amended.  
New claims 32-46 have been added.

***Allowed claims:***

The Examiner is thanked for allowing claims 10-19. Further, the Examiner has indicated that claims 5-7 and 24-25 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5-7 have been re-written in independent form. Claims 24 and 25 have been amended to include the limitations of original claim 20. Given the Examiner's reasons for allowance, it is submitted that claims 24 and 25 are also in condition for allowance.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-9, 20-21, 23, 27-29, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kudoh (U.S. 6008738). These rejections are respectfully traversed below.

As to claim 2, Examiner points to Kudoh, col. 3, lines 1-11. However, Applicant respectfully notes that nowhere in the text that Examiner refers is there any mention of ignoring subsequent key presses during the pause period. In fact, looking at Kudoh, column 3, lines 1-23, corresponding to figure 3, operations 32-38, it is clear that, if a key is pressed 33 during the timing period, operation 38 occurs.

By this amendment, claim 2 has been cancelled and the limitations of claim 2 have been incorporated into independent claim 1. Namely, claim 1 now recites:

setting a pause period for the overloaded key when said determining determines that the function of the overloaded key has switched so that subsequent presses of the overloaded key are ignored during the pause period.

It is clear that operation 38 in Kudoh occurs in response to a button press during Kudoh's pause period. Therefore, Kudoh cannot be said to ignore key presses during the pause period as detailed in claim 2 (now amended claim 1). Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claim 1 is patentably distinct over Kudoh as amended and respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Likewise, independent claims 20 and 27 have been amended to include limitations similar to that discussed above in reference to claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that claims 20 and 27 are patentably distinct over Kudoh for at least similar reasons as given for claim 1.

Further, independent claim 31 incorporates similar limitations to that discussed above with reference to claim 1 and is submitted to be patentably distinct from the prior art for at least similar reasons.

All other claims, including new claims 32-46, are dependent upon patentably distinct claims and are thus patentably distinct for the same reasons as given for the claims from which they depend.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Joseph Bond  
Reg. No. 52,633

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(650) 961-8300